<u>COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS</u>

Bristol, ss

Department of the Trial Court District Court Department Taunton Division

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS No. 0231 CR 1053 vs. JOSEPH AMARO COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS No. 0231 CR 1054 VS. VOL. I OF I DIMAS AMARO Pages 1 - 18

HEARING ON THE MERITS, JURY-WAIVED BEFORE THE HONORABLE GILBERT NADEAU

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH:

DAVID A. KOLMAN, Assistant District Attorney

FOR THE DEFENDANT JOSEPH AMARO:

ROBERT C. HEROUX, Attorney at Law

FOR THE DEFENDANT DIMAS AMARO:

MICHAEL J. SUNESON, Attorney at Law

Taunton District Court 15 Court Street Taunton, Massachusetts 02780 February 9, 2004

Transcribed by Ellen H. Dibble 43 West St., #9 Northampton, MA 01060-3714 (413) 584-7657

Waiver of jury, page 4 Stipulation, page 5

Statement of Attorney Kolman, page 6 Commonwealth rests, page 13

Motion for a required finding by Attorney Suneson, page 13 Attorney Heroux, page 15 Argument against a required finding, by Attorney Kolman, page 15

Finding by the judge, page 17

Redirect Witness Direct Cross Recross (No witnesses.)

Exhibit No. Description Page No.

Police report 1

18

2

Records (For each exhibit, it is not obvious the exhibit was received; and especially for Exhibit 2, it is not clear what the exhibit might be.)

1	THE COURT: With respect to Complaint Number
2	1054, Dimas Amaro, there are two counts?
3	ATTY. KOLMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Which allege the exact dates?
5	ATTY. KOLMAN: July 1st to June 2nd, 2001.
6	Your Honor, the Commonwealth is moving to amend
7	all the counts, instead of violation of 166, 42B, as
8	noted, just for court jurisdiction, to 166, 42A, where
9	I believe there is (inaudible) just for court
10	jurisdiction.
11	THE COURT: So is the Commonwealth moving to
12	amend it to Chapter 166, 42A.
13	ATTY. KOLMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: On both 1053 and 1054.
15	UNIDENTIFIED DEFENSE ATTORNEY: Right, Judge.
16	UNIDENTIFIED DEFENSE ATTORNEY: Yes, Your
17	Honor.
18	THE COURT: But there are two counts there
19	are still two counts standing?
20	ATTY. KOLMAN: No, I'm sorry, Your Honor.
21	The Commonwealth's only dismissed one count as
22	duplicitous.
23	THE COURT: Okay. So count 2 of Complaint
24	Number 1054 is dismissed as being duplicitous.

	ł I	
1.		
2		
3		
4		
5	-	
7		
8		
9		
LO		
L1		
L2		
L3		
L4		
L5		
L6		
L 7		
18		
L9		
20		
21		
2.2		

24

Then I have all these motions that, Mr. Suneson, that you had filed, right?

ATTY. SUNESON: (Inaudible) just leave those aside, Judge. That's for the jury.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Joseph Amaro and Mr. Dimas Amaro.

Joseph?

MR. DIMAS AMARO: Dimas.

THE COURT: Dimas. Joseph.

I have in front of me both signed waivers of your right to a trial by a jury. Did you sign that freely, willingly, and voluntarily, both of you?

UNIDENTIFIED DEFENDANT: Yes.

OTHER DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And you understand and your lawyers explained to you that you have a right to have this matter tried before a jury, which would consist of seven individuals, six of whom would be determining your guilt or innocence. And my role would be to preside over that trial and to rule upon objections and motions and to instruct the jury. And my role -- by you waiving your right to a trial by a jury, I become now the fact finder, and you're leaving a decision with respect to your guilt or innocence up

1	to me.
2	Do you understand that, gentlemen?
3	UNIDENTIFIED DEFENDANT: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Are you doing that freely,
5	willingly, and voluntarily?
6	UNIDENTIFIED DEFENDANT: Yes.
7	OTHER DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: All right.
9	Okay. I find that both jury waivers have been
10	made freely, willingly, and knowingly.
11	And the Commonwealth, are you ready to proceed?
12	ATTY. KOLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	ATTY. KOLMAN: Your Honor, we have reached an
15	agreement, a stipulation in regards to the police
16	report in this matter.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Are there any other
18	stipulations?
19	ATTY. KOLMAN: We do have a stipulation as
20	well of the disclaimer.
21	ATTY. SUNESON: Right. The stipulation of
22	fact, Judge. I believe it's filed with the Court.
23	THE COURT: I have that.
24	Do you want to sign that, Mr. Kolman?

following, Your Honor.

24

This involves an investigation that occurred from July 1st, 2000 to June 2001 where the defendants, Dimas Amaro and Joseph Amaro, were in the business of selling black boxes, also called converter boxes. The purpose of these boxes are that they can see receive every channel from a cable company. If a user were to hook up these boxes, they can receive every channel from the cable company; and they can receive every channel.

Now, in this investigation, they have an informant, a Abby Vasconcellos, who at the time was in a dating -- or had been in a dating relationship with one of the co-defendants, a Dimas Amaro.

She spoke to an individual who worked for an individual named Michael Wood, who was an AT&T investigator. Upon her conversation with Mr. Wood, she stated that the defendant and the co-defendant were in the business of shipping large boxes of -- large shipments of converter boxes where they were received from several companies; they would receive them and then they would sell them out to other individuals, including online, which would be -- online, in which Dimas Amaro would either post it on E-bay, as well as through Joe Amaro, who would sell locally.

Your Honor, several UPS -- several boxes were sent

to UPS which were seized, and in these boxes -- this occurred around a period of March 2nd, 2001 to March 1st, 2001, (sic) Your Honor. And when these packages were seized, several items were found.

The first package was addressed to Dimas Amaro, which contained -- at the residence of 333 Cohannet

Street. It contained three converter boxes along with a note indicating that two of the boxes were new but we were unable to get it to scramble (phonetic); a third box, which had been working properly, had suddenly stopped. This had a return address of an individual who was located in Texas. It appears she's looking either for a replacement or a refund.

The second package seized, Your Honor, was to -addressed to Joe Amaro. It had a total of eight
converter boxes and four remote controls. It appears
that upon investigation these boxes had been returned,
after examination, as several small notes had been
attached describing what had been wrong with the
converter boxes. This was shipped from Wholesale
Electronics, which is a company in Las Vegas, Nevada,
which ships out converter boxes.

The third package as well was addressed to the co-defendant, Joseph Amaro. Again, this time it's 12

converter boxes, with instructions how to use converter boxes to decode signals. It also had a credit card receipt, and it was again returned. The address was from Wholesale Electronics.

The fourth package was addressed to Dimas Amaro, and it contained a global converter as well as a remote box and wires.

All four of these packages were seized by the Taunton Police Department.

In addition, it appears that more boxes were seized on April 7, 2001, of pretty much the same variety, Your Honor.

Investigation revealed a UPS shipment in excess of 100 packages delivered to the defendants. This was from Wholesale Electronics. As well as there were 10 packages from another company called Clearview Cable, with 16 packages from INB Group electronics.

And in total there were at least 108 packages that were shipped to the defendant's address at -- the co-defendants' address, at 333 Cohannet Street.

Your Honor, in addition, an employee of AT&T (inaudible), Craig Frappier, with knowledge that some of these with knowledge that some of these converter boxes were being sold online, went to a site on -- went

1

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to a web site for excuse me. Went to a site to buy
the boxes and sent an e-mail, which was registered to
I believe it was an E-bay site. The e-mail was
addressed to Dimas Amaro, where he requested to buy
some boxes, converter boxes. These boxes were sold to
him, and he did send the money for the boxes.
Your Honor, based on this information, police
obtained search warrants for the residences of Dimas
Amaro and Joe Amaro, which was located at 333 Cohannet
Street, first floor and the second floor.
Among the items seized were two computers in the

rs in the living room -- this is in regard to Dimas Amaro's residence. Two computers in the living room were seized which had a customer list of individuals who the converter boxes were sold to. In addition, also found were 900 mailers which were used to -- similar to the one used to -- similar to the one used to send to one of the investigators in this investigation.

There were also 112 U.S. Postal Service delivery confirmations, and there were receipts, it appears, from these (inaudible), from April 21st to June 16th, 2001.

One of these mailings was to the investigator who bought the converter box, Your Honor.

Your Honor, in addition, both in regard to this 1 2 warrant, they spoke to the defendant, who made several statements. 3 Is this Mr. Dimas -- I mean, THE COURT: 5 Dimas? ATTY. KOLMAN: Dimas Amaro, yes. 7 He told the officer that it's not illegal to sell 8 the cable converter boxes. He sent them with a disclaimer, which was stipulated to, Your Honor. 9 In addition, he advised the officer that he was 10 not making very much money on these converter boxes. 11 He had not been in business very long, and that he had 12 checked with his attorney and was assured it was a 13 legal (phonetic) -- it was illegal for him to sell the 14 15 boxes after they were seized at UPS. Your Honor, it should about noted that after the 16 boxes were seized at UPS, the defendants did switch the 17 address of where to send the boxes to, and used their 18 19 grandparents' address, as opposed to their own. 20 Your Honor, also the second floor of the apartment, the residence of Joseph Amaro, was also 21 searched pursuant to a warrant. Found were \$7,800 in 22 23 U.S. currency, as well as an address book, which the

defendant Joe Amaro claims contains numbers of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Wholesale Electronics and Clearview Electronics, as well as particular notes in regard to the cable converters.

The defendant Joe Amaro also had a conversation with police officers where he stated that several individuals in the community had purchased several In addition, he wanted to know what was going on and asked why -- about the packages as there were receipts from UPS. He stated to the officer that he told his brother Dimas Amaro that, because they weren't making much money on the boxes and they had been seized, to get out of the business. He also indicated that they weren't making much money on boxes as they had to pay shipping and frequently received defective boxes.

Investigation was made on the boxes that were seized, Your Honor. They were able to scramble (phonetic) cable channels.

And the witness Abby Vasconcellos had stated to the officers that she had witnessed both defendants selling these boxes in the period of time, Your Honor.

That's Commonwealth's -- Commonwealth rests, Your Honor.

> THE COURT: Commonwealth rests?

If I may

23

2.4

ATTY. KOLMAN: Yes, Your Honor. 1 THE COURT: Mr. Suneson? 2 ATTY. KOLMAN: Actually, I'm sorry. 3 submit the police report. 4 (Commonwealth's Exhibit 1, police report, 5 could have been admitted here.) ATTY. SUNESON: Judge, we'd move for a 7 8 required finding of not guilty, Your Honor. And the reason for it, Judge, is that the 9 Commonwealth's -- one of the elements they have to show 10 was the intent to defraud. 11 With the stipulation of fact and my brother's --12 even all of it here, is that as a factual matter, my 13 client -- and it came forth, with regard to their 14 investigation of those cable boxes to begin with, that 15 16 when they wiped the hard drives, on each hard drive there was a disclaimer to the effect that they were not 17 advocating the theft of cable services. 18 The boxes themselves are not illegal to possess. 19 They're not illegal to sell. The only illegality comes 20 in if you intend to defraud the cable company. 21 22

With that stipulation of fact, Judge, there is no intent to defraud. That it's sold to customers, and customers can buy that particular box instead of

renting a box from a cable service. As long as they 1 take that box and they do what they do. 2 It's as if, Judge, going to the store on the 3 corner here, and asking them, I want a package of 4 rolling papers for my Bugle cigarettes. As long as I 5 take those packets of rolling papers for my Bugle 6 cigarettes and I sell them with my Bugle cigarettes for 7 8 tobacco, I'm not committing any crime. It's the fact that if I sell those packages of 9 rolling papers to somebody that I know is going to and 10 I know in fact is using them for marijuana cigarettes, 11 then in fact one could make the argument that there's 12 an intent there. 13 In this particular case, the Commonwealth has 14 not -- beyond all reasonable doubt, to even get to the 15 16 jury --That's -- that's --THE COURT: 17 ATTY. SUNESON: No, that's -- just to get to 18 the jury. 19 THE COURT: It's a different standard, 20 different standard. 21 I'm getting ahead of myself. 22 ATTY. SUNESON:

THE COURT: Go ahead.

ATTY. SUNESON: But just to get to the jury,

24

23

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	there has to be some evidence, somewhere, for the	
2	Commonwealth. The best light, best for the	
3	Commonwealth here: That my client intended to defrau	.cl
4	somebody, or this particular company. And with that	
5	stipulation of fact - that was before the Court - I	
6	don't believe this case will ever get to the trier of	:
7	fact on that particular element.	
8	THE COURT: Mr. Heroux, do you want to add	
9	anything? I assume you're agreeing	
10	ATTY. HEROUX: No, I would certainly join	
11	along with my brother. I would say it more eloquentl	-У
12	than he does, but he's brand new at this job, so.	
13	THE COURT: Mr. Kolman?	

ATTY. KOLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond to the motion?

ATTY. KOLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

Commonwealth believes that it does get by, Your Honor, under the burden for a required finding.

The defendants were selling black boxes. The reason why block boxes are sold, Your Honor, is so that people can get cable channels. I would argue that usually it's for people to get cable channels and not pay for it. Otherwise they would have to go through

the cable company themselves.

In addition, there's more -- there's more of an indication of the defendants' culpability; Once the items were seized from UPS, they changed the address to their grandparents' address, Your Honor, so that they would no longer have their name.

Your Honor, I feel that even with the disclaimer, the defendants both knew what they were doing, and their intent was to defraud the cable company.

For these reasons, the Commonwealth feels that it meets it is burden to get past the required finding.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Looking at the evidence in the light most favorable to the Commonwealth under the Lattimore standard, I'm going to deny both defendants' motion for a required finding of not guilty on both cases right now.

Does counsel -- do you wish to be heard any further with respect to arguing?

ATTY. SUNESON: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. And you don't intend to offer any evidence other than the stipulation?

ATTY. SUNESON: Just the stipulation, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to add

24

anything further, Mr. Kolman? 1 ATTY. KOLMAN: No, Your Honor. It's the same 2 argument for reference to the hyber (phonetic). 3 THE COURT: All right. It's my understanding 4 this is a specific intent crime under 42A, and I've 5 read the statute. I feel that the Commonwealth has not met their burden with respect to the element of intent, 7 and -- beyond a reasonable doubt. Therefore, there's 8 some reasonable doubt in my mind as to whether both 9 defendants intended to defraud, in accordance with the 10 statute. Therefore I find you both not guilty. 11 12 ATTY. KOLMAN: Thank you. THE CLERK: Dimas Amaro, Docket Number 02, 13 1054, count of unlawful possession of unlawful TV 14 devices, not guilty. 15 16 Joseph Amaro, docket number 02, 1053, unlawful possession of a TV device, is also not guilty. 17 THE COURT: Is there any other reason to hold 18 either of them? 19 20 THE CLERK: I think that's it, Judge. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

THE COURT: Mr. Kolman, are these --

Thank you.

I, Ellen H. Dibble, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript, prepared to the best of my ability, of the designated portions of the cassettes provided to me by the appellants or appellees of a hearing in the matter of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts versus Joseph Amaro, Docket Number 0231 CR 1053 and Commonwealth of Massachusetts versus Dimas Amaro, Docket Number 0231 CR 1054, before Gilbert Nadeau, J., in Taunton District Court, Taunton, Massachusetts, on February 9, 2004.

Date: 11/1/05 Transcriber: San H-Dubble

2.2

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

2.4